

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 10, 15, 16, 19-21, 24, 25, and 30 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 15, 16, 21, and 30 are independent claims. Claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 19, 20, 24, and 25 are dependent claims.

Claims 1, 4-6, 9, 10, 15, 16, 19-21, 24, 25, and 30 have been rejected.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In numbered paragraphs 2 and 3 on pages 2-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-6, 9, 10, 15, 16, 19-21, 24, 25, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kageyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,638). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons presented below.

Claim 1 recites a printer having “a separation unit separating the print data into separate sets of data according to the different types of data ...”

Kageyama does not teach or suggest the separation unit of the present invention. The Examiner asserted in numbered paragraph 4 on page 4 of the Office Action that column 13, lines 57-63, of Kageyama teach separating data to be printed into multiple data sets depending on the type of data. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Column 13, lines 57-63, of Kageyama states that a real drawing operation is executed “for setting the drawing attribute parameters and drawing characters, graphics data or image data into the acquired page buffer ...” In Kageyama, the parameters include “the type of a character font, the pitch of character rows, the pitch of character columns, the width and sort of a line, the size of a paper sheet, the number of copies, and the paper feed portion and paper delivery portion of a printer” (Kageyama at col. 22, line 62 to col. 23, line 2).

The setting of data attribute parameters in Kageyama is performed to control the appearance of the data on the paper (e.g., by designating the character font) and to control the paper itself (e.g., the size of the paper and the number of copies). The **setting** of data attribute parameters is not the same as “**separating** the print data into separate sets of data according to the different **types of data**” (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, it is submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art. Independent claims 6, 15, 16, 21, and 30 recite language similar to that of claim 1, except that claim 6 is directed to a controller controlling a printer to output print data, claim 15 is directed to a method of processing print data, claim 16 is directed to an image forming apparatus, claim 21 is directed to a controller controlling a printer to output form data, and claim 30 is directed to a method of processing form data. Thus, for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1, it is submitted that independent claims 6, 15, 16, 21, and 30 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

As for the dependent claims, the dependent claims respectively depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for at least the reasons discussed above.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1, 4-6, 9, 10, 15, 16, 19-21, 24, 25, and 30 patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under § 102.

Request for Return of Form PTO-1449

On September 11, 2002 Applicants filed an Information Disclosure Statement with a Form PTO-1449 and an Attachment 1(g) (List of Additional Submitted Documents). The Examiner has returned an initialed copy of Attachment 1(g). The Examiner returned a copy of the Form PTO-1449 with the September 24, 2003 Office Action. However, the Examiner had not initialed the second reference (reference AF, JP 09-123541). Accordingly, it is requested that the Examiner confirm consideration of reference JP 09-123541 by initialing the box next to this reference and returning the Form PTO-1449. For the Examiner's convenience, copies of the IDS, the Form PTO-1449, the Attachment 1(g), and the stamped postcard are attached to this response.

Conclusion

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims

Serial No. 09/138,378

Docket No. 1046.1188

patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding rejections, the application is submitted to be in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Finally, if there are any additional fees associated with filing of this response, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/9/03

By: C. Joan Gilsdorf
Christine Joan Gilsdorf
Registration No. 43,635

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501